



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/505,253

08/18/2004

Iwan Roland Rasa

3909

30593

7590

12/15/2008

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. BOX 8910

RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/15/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/505,253

**Applicant(s)**

RASA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jason Daniel Prone

**Art Unit**

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-43, 47, 49, 51 and 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-43, 47, 49, 51 and 52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☒ Other: Appendix A & Appendix B

### DETAILED ACTION

As noted in a previous Office action, the Neveu reference (3,961,418) was previously cited on the PTO-892 (reference K) as part of the Office action mailed 21 November 2006. See Appendix B showing the PTO-892 from that Office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-43, 47, 49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neveu (3,961,418) in view of De Vault (2,106,796). Please see Appendix A for examiner added reference numerals to Neveu.

In regards to claim 35, Neveu discloses the same invention including a peeler for peeling in a peeling direction (Title) comprising two lateral gripping surfaces (100) interconnected by a blade (22) and by a cross-piece (102), wherein the two lateral surfaces together with the cross-piece for a substantially U-shaped holder (Fig. 2), the peeler being shorter in the peeling direction than a distance between the lateral surfaces at the peeling blade (See Appendix A, the Peeling Direction is labeled PD and the dimension of the peeler along line PD is clearly less than the spacing between gripping surfaces S), and the cross-piece extends relative to the peeling direction above the peeling blade when used (orientation shown in Appendix A Fig. 4).

In regards to claim 36, Neveu discloses the lateral surfaces are constructed that they may be clamped between the thumb and a finger (Fig. 2).

In regards to claims 38 and 39, Neveu discloses the crosspiece extends transversely to the peeling direction and is formed as a surface (102) and the crosspiece is vaulted concave in a direction towards the blade (102).

In regards to claim 41, Neveu discloses the lateral gripping surfaces and the crosspiece are integrally formed (100 and 102).

In regards to claims 42 and 43, Neveu discloses a gripping depression is formed into each lateral surface (14) and at least one of the lateral surfaces comprises an abutment for the blade (24).

In regards to claims 47, 49, and 52, Neveu discloses the cross-piece is flat (102 is flat on the side), the blade and the cross-piece are arranged such that the blade is observable from above (Appendix A, Fig. 4) and the lateral surfaces and cross-piece are made from plastic (column 1 lines 60-63).

However, with regards to claims, 35, 37, 40, and 51, Neveu fails to disclose the peeling blade has a cutting edge and a guiding piece, each lateral gripping surface includes a bearing for the blade, the blade is formed as a pendulum blade rotatably held at the gripping surfaces, and the peeling blade is straight.

De Vault teaches it is old and well known in the art of peelers to incorporate a peeling blade that has a cutting edge (36) and a guiding piece (37), each lateral gripping surface includes a bearing for the blade (41), the blade is formed as a pendulum blade rotatably held at the gripping surfaces (34), and the peeling blade is straight (34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Neveu with the blade, as taught by De Vault, because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results and all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

Also, Neveu fails to disclose the distance between the lateral gripping surfaces at the peeling blade is larger than a height of the peeler. Looking at Appendix A, it would have been obvious to shrink the "L" dimension to accommodate a hand with shorter fingers. It is old and well known to experiment/try larger and smaller size components since not everybody has the same sized/shaped body parts. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the distance between the lateral gripping surfaces at the peeling blade be larger than a length and height of the peeler, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Also, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the distance between the lateral gripping surfaces at the peeling blade be larger than a length and height of the peeler, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Neveu to obtain

the invention as specified in claim 35. The claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product is not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 35-43, 47, 49, and 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Martinsen ('503, '573), Hartlaub et al., and Tipton.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Daniel Prone whose telephone number is (571)272-4513. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

09 December 2008

/Jason Daniel Prone/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724

Appendix A





Appendix B

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>	Application/Control No. 10/505,253	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination RASA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason Prome	Art Unit 3724	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

* A	Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	US-542,606 A	07-1865	Chromwell	30/280
*	B US-1,071,603 A	06-1913	Castello	30/280
*	C US-1,156,652 A	10-1915	Allen	30/280
*	D US-1,229,935 A	06-1917	Lilipetka	30/279.4
*	E US-2,106,799 A	02-1938	De Vault	30/280
*	F US-2,228,572 A	01-1941	Lo/gren	30/279.6
*	G US-2,564,169 A	05-1951	Hall	30/280
*	H US-2,829,434 A	04-1958	Schweikart	30/280
*	I US-2,586,813 A	05-1961	De Vault	30/280
*	J US-3,571,925 A	03-1971	Deutschmann, Herbert F.	C7/693
→ *	K US-3,981,418 A	08-1976	Neyou, Michael J.	99/590
*	L US-5,865,110 A	02-1990	Yonerzwo, Tooru	30/279.6
*	M US-D601,123 S	01-2005	Rasa, Iwan	D7/865

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

* A	Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
N	WO-03/070079 A1	09-2003	WIPO	Rasa et al.	
O	JP-16155647	05-1998	Japan	Kiyofushi	
P					
Q					
R					
S					
T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

* A	Include as applicable: Author, Title, Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages
U	
V	
W	
X	

\* A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(g))  
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.